

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18. Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 13 and 16-18 are amended herein, and new claim 19 is added. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 3, 5-9 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,760,745 (Tan).

Tan is directed to replicating customized web pages from a replicated server configuration upon receiving a request for a document including an identifier from a client computer. In Tan, a WebAgent server (420) is coupled with a customer service representative computer (425) and interconnects a client computer (405) and the customer service representative computer (425) such that the WebAgent server (420) directly controls interactive help sessions (see, col. 8, lines 31-39 and FIG. 4). That is, the WebAgent server (420) contacts the customer service representative computer (425) and sends a copy of a dynamically generated HTML document to the customer service representative computer (425).

The present invention enables clients to function as a master client to control other apparatuses, or as a slave client to be remotely operated by a master client affiliated with the same group as the slave client.

Independent claims 3 and 7 as amended recite, "a remote operation control unit simultaneously transmitting the processing results to the first control unit and to a second control unit different from the first control unit that is in a group relationship with the first control unit" ("first and second apparatus" in claim 7). Independent claims 13 and 16-18 also recite that the second control unit and the second apparatus is "in a group" with which the first control unit or apparatus is related or affiliated.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Tan.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Tan. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claims 6, 9 and 15 recite, "the request is a request to obtain a Web page, the execution unit obtains the Web page, and the remote operation control unit simultaneously transmits the Web page obtained by the execution unit to the first control unit

and to the second control unit.” Tan does not teach or suggest these features of claims 6, 9 and 15.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: Tan, U.S. Patent No. 6,650,747 (Bala) and U.S. Patent No. 5,768,508 (Eikeland).

Bala is directed to monitoring a merchant application via a customer service representative (CSR) station. As shown in FIG. 2 of Bala, a virtual network computing (VNC) software is loaded at the computer (200) to display the merchant application on a monitor workstation (250) that also has a viewer portion of the software enabled (see, col. 10, lines 42-52). That is, in Bala, both the VNC server and VNC viewer software are loaded at each station to execute the monitoring (see, col. 9, lines 6-15 and col. 11, lines 35-39).

The Examiner acknowledges that Tan and Bala do not teach that the user operation of the second apparatus is disabled when the second apparatus is being remotely operated, but relies on Eikeland as teaching the same. However, Eikeland is limited to providing targeted information to a user via a client (122) program downloaded by the user and disabling the user’s input by the client (122) to cause the user to view the targeted information without interruption (see, col. 3, lines 65 through col. 4, line 3, col. 7, lines 2-6 and FIG. 1).

Independent claims 1, 2 and 10 recite that the remote operation method and system of the present invention includes obtaining the Web page from a Web server and sending “the Web page to the first device and to the second device that is in a group relationship with the first device.” This enables a remote operation relationship to be established between “the first device as a master device and the second device as a slave device”, where “the first device and the second device each display the Web page on a display” (see, claim 2).

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, dependent claims 4 and 12 are also patentable over the cited references.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 19 has been added to recite, “identifying a group affiliation of a first device requesting a connection” and “transmitting a request of the first device to a second device

having the group affiliation of the first device." This allows "establishing a remote operation between the second device operating as a master client and the first device operating as a slave client by disabling a user operation with respect to the first device."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-discussed features of new claim 19.

Therefore, it is submitted that new claim 19 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

11/14/15

By: _____



J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501